REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 17-18, 20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cohen et al.* (US 6,654,741) in view of *Risvik* (US 6,377,945). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 9 and 17) recites a step of "defining a subset of characters as delimiters such that all remaining characters are defined as non-delimiters." Thus, the claimed defining step defines two types of characters, namely, delimiters and non-delimiters. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed defining step is disclosed by *Cohen* in col. 5, lines 31-53. In col. 5, lines 31-53, *Cohen* teaches input expressions can be defined according to a predefined syntax, but does not teach or suggest the defining of two types of characters such as the claimed delimiters and non-delimiters.

Claim 1 also recites a step of constructing a search key by "generating a full match search increment comprising the binary representation of a data string element, wherein said data string element includes a plurality of non-delimiters between a pair of delimiters" and by "concatenating a pattern search prefix to said full match search increment to form said search key." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed constructing step is disclosed by *Cohen* in col. 6, lines 51-67. However, *Cohen* does not even mention the term "search key" (or its equivalent) in col. 6, lines 51-67. Furthermore, the claimed search key is partially constructed by the previously mentioned delimiters and non-delimiters. *Cohen* does not teach or suggest the claimed delimiters and non-delimiters (or the predefined syntax as characterized by the Examiner) in col. 6, lines 51-67.

In addition, Claim 1 recites a step of "performing a full match search within a lookup table utilizing said search key." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed performing step is disclosed by *Cohen* in col. 6, lines 10-43. The claimed lookup table

is not mentioned in col. 6, lines 10-43 of *Cohen*. Also, since the claimed performing step has to be executed after the claimed constructing step because the claimed performing step utilizes the search key from the claimed constructing step, it would not make sense for *Cohen* to explain the claimed performing step in col. 6, lines 10-43 before explaining the claimed constructing step in col. 6, lines 51-67. Thus, it is clear that *Cohen* does not teach or suggest the claimed performing step in col. 6, lines 10-43.

Risvik does not teach or suggest the claimed defining, constructing and performing steps either. Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS